DETAILED ACTION

The instant application having Application No. 10/597,427 is presented for

examination by the examiner.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.

119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been received.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-8 and 10-13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Each of the dependent claims should be written to incorporate all the limitations

of the parent claim. As such the dependent claims should reference their parent claim

by "the" method or "the" device, not "a" method or "a" device. Use of "the" removes any

doubt as to whether the method (or device) is the same method of its parent and not a

similar method.

As per claim 11, an interface should be differentiated from the interface defined

in claim 9.

As per claim 12, "the home interface configuration" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 4, the phrases "for example" and "such as" render the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by USP 7,207,059 to Kurian et al., hereinafter Kurian.

As per claim 1, Kurian teaches a dongle for access of guest apparatuses to a

wireless home network (col. 3, lines 40-45), comprising a memory and processing unit

which is connected to the guest apparatus by means of an antenna (col. 4, lines 5-7) as

well as a configuration-free interface (col. 3, line 56 and col. 4, lines 23-28).

As per claim 2, Kurian teaches that the configuration-free interface is a USB

interface (col. 4, lines 25-30).

As per claim 3, Kurian teaches the current supply for the dongle is realized via

the USB interface (col. 4, lines 25-30).

As per claim 9, Kurian teaches a method of connecting guest apparatuses to

wireless home networks, wherein the access of the guest apparatus is realized via a

dongle which is connected to an interface of the guest apparatus (col. 1, lines 55-60 and

col. 2, lines 5-15).

As per claim 10, Kurian teaches that the dongle reports to the home network

independently (col. 2, line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurian in view of USP Application Publication 2005/0193103 to Drabik.

As per claim 4, Kurian is silent in explicitly disclosing the dongle has an integrated protection unit such as, for example, a firewall or a virus scanner. Drabik discloses that a small integrated IC card that connects to a computer via an interface has a VPN module embedded in it (0144). Drabik discloses that one of the functions of the VPN system is to provide firewall services (0155). One of ordinary skill in the art could have embedded the VPN system including its firewall into the dongle taught by Kurian and it would have provided secure network access. The claim is obvious because combining known elements which produce predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 13, Kurian is silent in disclosing the dongle acts as a router between the guest apparatus and the home network and that, to this end, the guest apparatus has an appropriate IP address. Drabik discloses that a small integrated IC card that connects to a computer via an interface has a VPN module embedded in it which is

effectively an entire router and gateway (0144). Routers are known for assigning IP

addresses. One of ordinary skill in the art could have embedded the VPN system

including its router into the dongle taught by Kurian and it would have provided a

network access to a plurality of devices. Kurian teaches a network in which multiple

devices communicate (col. 5, lines 28-30). The claim is obvious because combining

known elements which produce predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of

one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kurian in view of USP Application Publication 2004/0123113 to

Mathiassen et al., hereinafter Mathiassen.

As per claims 5 and 6, Kurian is silent in explicitly disclosing that the dongle has

a biometric device for user authentication and that the biometric device is a fingerprint

scanner. Mathiassen teaches a dongle that has a biometric device for user

authentication and that the biometric device is a fingerprint scanner (0054). Fingerprint

readers allow the system to authenticate the user. Combining this teaching with Kurian

yields a more secure network whereby the user must first be authenticated before using

the computer and/or network. The claim is obvious because combining known

elements which produce predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one of

ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 11, Kurian is silent in explicitly disclosing that configuration parameters, which are loaded via an interface of the dongle, are stored in the dongle. Examiner supplies the same rationale as recited in the rejection of claim 5 for combining the dongle of Mathiassen including its fingerprint reader into the dongle taught by Kurian. Mathiassen also teaches that the user's stored fingerprints with its minutia parameter (0071) are downloaded into the dongle's memory (0062). The claim is obvious because combining known elements which produce predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 12, Kurian is silent in explicitly disclosing that the home interface configuration of the dongle is not visible to the guest apparatus. Examiner supplies the same rationale as recited in the rejection of claim 5 for combining the dongle of Mathiassen including its fingerprint reader into the dongle taught by Kurian. Having combined those references, Mathiassen teaches that the stored fingerprints are not accessible to external memory and the dongle can performed the authentication within itself (0052 and 0071). If the guest apparatus could see the stored fingerprints, there would be a lack of security. Mathiassen also teaches that the authentication by this process is faster than relying on outside computers. Therefore performing the authentication inside the dongle is both faster and more secure. The claim is obvious because combining known elements which produce predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kurian in view of USP Application Publication 2006/0219776 to Finn.

As per claims 7 and 8, Kurian is silent in explicitly disclosing that the dongle has

an additional configuration interface and that the configuration interface is a card reader.

Finn teaches a dongle that has an additional configuration interface and that the

configuration interface is a card reader (0259). Card readers allow the system to

efficiently add memory by inserting a memory card into the card reader. Combining this

teaching with Kurian yields a more robust dongle whereby additional memory could be

made available to the dongle without having to replace the dongle. It was known at the

time of the invention to include card readers on dongles. The claim is obvious because

combining known elements which produce predictable results is within the ordinary

capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure is listed on the enclosed PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. VAUGHAN whose telephone number is

(571)270-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am

- 5:00pm, EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. R. V./

Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/William R. Korzuch/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431